William Nitkin
ATTORNEY AND COUNSELLOR AT LAW
PATENTS, TRADEMARKS, COPYRIGHTS

O DE 1000 E

Commissioner for Patents P. O. Box 1450 Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

In Re the Application of: Gregory R. Brotz Serial No. 10/010,447 Filed: 11/09/2001

For: Superconductive Geomagnetic Craft

(1) E.Burns 87/01/03 A

850 BOYLSTON STREET (ROUTE 9)
CHESTNUT HILL, MASSACHUSETTS 02167

TELEPHONE 617-232-1854 FAX 617-232-1855

June 24, 2003

Group Art Unit 3643 JUN 3 0 2003
Examiner
Timothy D. Collaboration

Dear Sir:

Attached hereto please find Response to the Office Action of 02/26/2003. It is requested that the period for response be extended for one month to 06/26/2003. Enclosed is check for \$55.00 for the one-month extension fee. Should there be any other fee due, please charge it to my Deposit Account No. 14-1137. Kindly forward the attached postcard stating date of receipt of this Response. Thank you.

Very truly yours,

William Nitkin, Registration No. 27,220

WN/ra Encl.

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING

I hereby certify that this correspondence with Response and check for \$55.00 for one month extension fee is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as first class mail in an envelope addressed to: Commissioner for Patents, P. O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450, on June 24, 2003.

Date: June 24, 2003

William Nitkin, Registration No. 27,220

06/30/2003 MBIZUNES 00000073 10010447

01 FC:2251

55.00 OP

In Re the Application of: Gregory R. Brotz Serial No. 10/010,447

Filed: 11/09/2001

For: Superconductive Geomagnetic Craft

Group Art Unit 3643 Examiner Timothy D. Collins

RESPONSE TO OFFICE ACTION OF 02/26/2003

Commissioner for Patents P. O. Box 1450 Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Dear Sir:

In Response to the Office Action of 02/26/2003, please amend the application as follows: IN THE SPECIFICATION:

On page 19 line 6 please delete the word "magnetocaloric".

On page 19 lines 6 - 11 please delete the two sentences starting from the word "For" to the word "nitrogen."

On page 19 line 15 please delete "cold fusion,".

REMARKS

In the first Office Action the Examiner required a Terminal Disclaimer to overcome a double patenting rejection, and rejected Claim 1 in view of Wachspress. In Response thereto the Applicant provided a Terminal Disclaimer and canceled Claim 1. Claims 2 and 3 were amended to overcome the rejection in view of the prior art. In the current Office Action the Examiner has indicated the acceptance of the Terminal Disclaimer but has not indicated whether the rejection under 35 USC 102 has been accepted in view of the amendments and arguments previously filed.